I2FHEVAC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 3 4 17 Cr. 684 (ER) V. 5 LAMONT EVANS, EMANUEL RICHDARDSON, ANTHONY BLAND, CHRISTIAN DAWKINS, and MERL CODE, 6 7 Conference Defendants. 8 9 New York, N.Y. 10 February 15, 2018 2:40 p.m. 11 Before: 12 HON. EDGARDO RAMOS, 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN Interim United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 NOAH SOLOWIEJCZYK ALINE R. FLODR 18 Assistant United States Attorneys WILLIAM R. MARTIN 19 Attorney for Defendant Lamont Evans 20 CRAIG J. MORDOCK 21 Attorney for Defendant Emanuel Richardson 22 JEFFREY HARRIS LICHTMAN JEFFREY BENSON EINHORN 23 Attorneys for Defendant Anthony Bland 24 STEVEN A. HANEY, SR. Attorney for Defendant Christian Dawkins 25

```
I2FHEVAC
                              APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
 1
      JOEL COHEN
 2
      MARK C. MOORE
           Attorneys for Defendant Merl Code
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

24

25

1	(Case called)
2	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Good afternoon. Noah Solowiejczyk
3	on behalf of the government. I'm joined by Aline Flodr,
4	another Assistant U.S. Attorney in our office.
5	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
6	MR. COHEN: Joel Cohen for Mr. Code who's sitting in
7	the jury box.
8	MR. MOORE: Mark Moore for Mr. Code, your Honor.
9	MR. LICHTMAN: Jeffrey Lichtman and Jeffrey Einhorn
10	for Anthony Bland. Good morning, your Honor. His appearance
11	was waived.
12	MR. HANEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Steve Haney
13	on behalf Christian Dawkins.
14	MR. MARTIN: William Martin on behalf of Lamont Evans,
15	and your Honor waived his appearance also. He waived it on the
16	record.
17	MR. MORDOCK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Craig
18	Mordock on behalf of Emanuel Richardson, and Mr. Richardson's
19	presence was waived at the last court appearance.
20	THE COURT: This matter is on for status conference,
21	Mr. Solowiejczyk. Did I pronounce that right?
22	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You did, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: OK.

Honor, the government has been producing discovery on an

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Since the last conference, your

ongoing and rolling basis. At this point discovery is substantially complete. We've produced all the Title III wire intercepts which amount to, you know, hundreds of hours of calls. We've produced search warrant returns, subpoena returns, bank records, returns from universities. It's a voluminous amount of material. There are probably still a few outstanding items because some of the subpoenas that we've served. We're still getting returns on those, but we do think at this point the defense has substantially all the discovery. And anything that would give rise to any motions, we believe they have at this point.

THE COURT: So they have everything that you have at least?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Pretty much. There are probably a few exception, and we're working on getting those out the door, but pretty much all the big-ticket items, they have what we have.

THE COURT: When do you expect it will be complete?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is a ballpark guess. I would think that all of the discovery may take another month or two, but we're talking about an entity may respond to our subpoena and say, oh, we've identified additional documents. When we get them, we give them to the defense, things of that nature.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: The one other item is on some of

the search warrants, your Honor, we conduct a relevance review.
For example, on a phone search warrant, we give the entirety of
the phone to the person whose phone it is. We then conduct a
relevance review, and anything that's within the scope of the
search warrant, we produce to all of the other defendants.
That relevance review is ongoing. We're hoping to have it
complete within the next 30 days.
THE COURT: But all of the owners of the phones have
the contents of their phones?
MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Correct.
THE COURT: Very well. Is there a motion schedule in

this case?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Not at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, if I may, Judge, we did have an opportunity to speak with the government before you took the bench to discuss a motion schedule, including trial schedule, if your Honor would permit.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: Judge, with your permission we would request all motions to be filed by the defense to be filed in July, if that date is --

THE COURT: Is there agreement on that date?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: The government is fine with that schedule, your Honor.

1	THE COURT: OK.
2	MR. MARTIN: July 30, the end of the month. July 30
3	is a Monday, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: OK.
5	MR. MARTIN: The government would have 30 days upon
6	filing of our motions to respond, and defense would have 14
7	days upon receipt of the government's pleading to file a reply.
8	THE COURT: Do we have actual dates on that?
9	MR. MARTIN: I can do that, Judge. I did not.
10	THE COURT: We can do that.
11	MR. MARTIN: Thirty days would be August 30, your
12	Honor, and 14 days from that would be the
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: September 13.
14	MR. MARTIN: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: As I understand it, both Judges Kaplan and
16	Preska have set trial dates, correct?
17	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: That's correct, your Honor. Trial
18	before Judge Kaplan is scheduled for October 1. Trial before
19	Judge Preska is scheduled February. I don't remember the exact
20	date. I think February 9 sounds familiar, but let me just
21	check.
22	THE COURT: I know that there's overlap in parties at
23	least between Judge Kaplan and I, correct?
24	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Correct, your Honor. February 4, I
25	think, is the trial before Judge Preska, your Honor, in the

1	Persons matter.
2	THE COURT: Did you folks have a conversation about a
3	potential trial date?
4	MR. MARTIN: We have, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: What is that?
6	MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, with the government's trial
7	schedule and the dates with the trials we've just referenced,
8	we would ask for a trial in April or May of 2019.
9	THE COURT: I think we are, at this point anyway,
10	still open for April of 2019.
11	Ms. Rivera.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes.
13	THE COURT: How about something in the third week of
14	April.
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: April 15. Monday, April 15, 2019.
16	MR. LICHTMAN: That's a bad luck day, Judge.
17	MR. MARTIN: All the defense counsel reacted the same
18	way.
19	THE DEPUTY CLERK: April 22.
20	THE COURT: What are you hiding?
21	MR. LICHTMAN: I can't speak for me, Judge.
22	MR. MARTIN: April 15?
23	THE COURT: April 22.
24	How long will this case take?
25	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Government's proof probably will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

three weeks, three to four weeks, I would say.

THE COURT: My understanding is that Judge Kaplan also this morning, at least from the bench, denied the motions to dismiss, and I think the last time we were together, folks at the back table told me that the motion in this case would be different, is that correct, or slightly different?

MR. MOORE: I think we said perhaps similar but different, slightly different motion.

THE COURT: But you're still going to make the motion?

MR. MOORE: I think we're all going to have to talk about this afterwards, but I believe --

MR. LICHTMAN: Yes.

MR. MOORE: I believe that that's the case, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Is there anything else that we need to do today?

MR. MARTIN: Nothing else.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, two matters. One is are we doing April 15 or 22nd?

THE COURT: 22nd.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: 22nd, OK, for the trial date.

One matter to bring to your Honor's attention, and we just wanted to put this on the record, there is a protective order in this case, your Honor. As you may recall, there are two. There's one that relates to information the government

T2FHEVAC

has deemed particularly sensitive and confidential, and we, whenever we produce such materials, designated them as confidential with the defense. There have been a couple instances in the last month where there's been some information reported in the press that we believe emanates from confidential discovery in this case.

THE COURT: In this particular case?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: In this case and in the case before Judge Kaplan.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We're not seeking any relief at this time, but if this continues to happen, we may come to the Court and seek appropriate relief. We just wanted to put that on the record because this is a protective order that your Honor entered, and it's of significant concern to the government.

THE COURT: Is there a similar order or same order in Judge Kaplan's case?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So you're not asking for anything right now?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We're not asking for anything right now. We just wanted to put it on the record that the government takes this protective order that your Honor entered quite seriously.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Other than that, your Honor, we would just ask to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act between today and the trial date. That will allow the defendants to continue to review discovery, to make any motions that they deem appropriate, and for the parties to engage in any discussions of a potential disposition.

THE COURT: Very well. Any objection?

MR. MARTIN: No, your Honor.

MR. MOORE: No, your Honor.

MR. LICHTMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll exclude time between now and April 22 of 2019 under the Speedy Trial Act for the reasons put forth on the record by the prosecution. I find that the interests of the public in a speedy and public trial does not outweigh the interest of the defendants in continuing to review the discovery and making a determination as to appropriate motions.

I look to the back. I don't know if anyone wanted to make any comment on the government's comment about protected discovery.

MR. MARTIN: On behalf of Mr. Evans, I don't know what he's talking about. We have no comment.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, I would say that there's certainly been mention in the press about some of the materials

that were turned over pursuant to discovery and other, but I don't know that I would necessarily suggest that if there's any leak, that it came from the defense side. It certainly could have come from the government side as well, as far as I can tell. So I wouldn't necessarily think this is a defense situation, whether it be in this case or the other cases.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: I would just note, your Honor, if a defense attorney receives a call from a reporter asking them to confirm the existence of something that's confidential material, our view is confirming the existence of that material violates the protective order.

THE COURT: If there's nothing else, very good.

(Adjourned)